

**Remarks**

This Response is responsive to the Office Action of **March 24, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-31** is respectfully requested.

**Summary of The Office Action**

**Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 13-31** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,636,203).

**Claims 9 and 12** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,636,203) in view of Towle (U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,765).

**37 CFR § 1.131 Declaration of Prior Invention**

Applicant submits with this Response a §1.131 Declaration executed by the inventor, Aloke Gupta. The Declaration establishes that the present invention was conceived prior to the effective date of the Wong Patent. Thus, the Wong Patent should be removed as a reference and the rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that the present rejections are based upon a U.S. Patent by another that does not claim the same patentable invention as defined in 41.203(a) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131(a)(1). Additionally, the present rejections are not based upon a statutory bar in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131(a)(2). Therefore, the Declaration is appropriate.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-31** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

24-JUNE-2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETAR Kraguljac (Reg. No. 38,520)  
(216) 348-5843